DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 769 HE 018 942

AUTHOR Skobjak, Bernadette L.; McKee, Barbara
TITLE An Evaluation of a College-Wide Planning and Budgeting Process.
INSTITUTION Rochester Inst. of Technology, NY. National Technical Inst. for the Deaf.
PUB DATE Jul 85
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Budgeting; College Administration; *College Planning; Deans; Department Heads; Departments; Educational Objectives; Feedback; Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Program Administration; Questionnaires; *Scheduling; Technical Institutes; Time
IDENTIFIERS Institutional Mission; *National Technical Institute for the Deaf NY; *Rochester Institute of Technology NY

ABSTRACT

Results of an evaluation of the yearly planning and budgeting process of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf at Rochester Institute of Technology are presented. To examine the effectiveness of modifications to the 1985 planning and budgeting system, 42 questionnaires were completed by assistant and associate deans, directors, chairpeople, and managers, and interviews were held with the dean, associate vice president, and the assistant to the director. Questionnaire findings include: 83 percent of the respondents felt the 1985 planning/budgeting calendar allowed them adequate time to involve appropriate people in the planning process; 90 percent of the administrators felt the planning calendar helped keep them on schedule; only 40 percent felt the planning process occurred at the appropriate time during the year; almost all respondents thought their department, division, or school mission profile followed the prescribed format; the main problems in developing profiles were categorizing certain activities and accounting for ad hoc projects; and about 67 percent of administrators felt interdivisional planning meetings were productive. Areas considered in the interviews were the timing of the planning/budgeting process, which currently extends for 2.5 to 3 months, and the mission profiles. The 30-page questionnaire is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED264769

AN EVALUATION OF A COLLEGE-WIDE PLANNING AND BUDGETING PROCESS

Dr. Bernadette L. Skobjak, Coordinator
Planning and Policy Analysis

Dr. Barbara McKee, Chairperson
Educational Research and Development

National Technical Institute for the Deaf
Rochester Institute of Technology
716-475-6407

July, 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bernadette L. Skobjak

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To examine the effectiveness of modifications to the 1985 planning and budgeting system, a questionnaire was sent to NTID/RIT assistant/associate deans, directors, chairpeople, and managers and an interview/discussion was held with the Dean, Associate Vice President, and the Assistant to the Director. Approximately 70 questionnaires were mailed and 42 were returned.

I. CALENDAR

This year's evaluation showed that:

- o 83% of the respondents felt the 1985 planning/budgeting calendar allowed them sufficient time to adequately involve appropriate people in the planning and budgeting process and they had no difficulty in meeting various due dates.
- o 90% of the administrators felt the planning calendar was useful in keeping them on schedule.
- o Only 40% felt the planning process occurred at the appropriate time during the year.
- o When asked if they feel NTID spends too much time on planning, a slight majority of people (58%) said no, the amount of time was appropriate for the task.

II. MISSION PROFILES

Almost all respondents thought their department, division or school Mission Profile followed the prescribed format and a majority (63%) indicated they had no special problems organizing their activities into the prescribed categories. They felt their Mission Profiles were an accurate portrayal of the activities of their department. The main problems in developing Profiles were categorizing certain activities and accounting for ad hoc projects that arise during the year.

- o The Mission Profiles <u>are</u> used later in the year for such purposes as the <u>Annual Report</u> or appraisals.
- o 88% said their Mission Profiles were very similar from year to year with only numbers and titles of some projects changing.

III. INTERDIVISIONAL PLANNING

Is there commitment from administrators to Interdivisional Planning? There is modest commitment since about 67% of the administrators felt the Interdivisional Planning meetings were productive and better than half (61%) said that although the meetings could probably be replaced with written requests that the personal contact is useful. Responses were about evenly divided concerning the amount of paperwork generated, and there were many suggestions for reducing paperwork and improving the process.

IV. OVERALL PROCESS

This year NTID planned only for the coming fiscal year and not for the "out" year (succeeding fiscal year).

- o 68% of the respondents said the change was positive. No one felt their planning was affected negatively.
- o The majority (66%) of the respondents said the planning process was easier for them this year when compared to previous years. The majority of the general written comments on the 1985 planning and budgeting process were positive.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

1. Although a large majority of people are generally satisfied with the amount of time allotted for planning and budgeting, there is disagreement as to when during the year the planning and budgeting process should occur.

2. Interdivisional Planning, although thought to be productive, continues to be problematic for people. People complained about the crunch of time, the pressure to produce needs statements early in the planning process, and the amount of paperwork required.

3. People do take the planning guidelines and the planning process itself seriously. For example, faculty and staff write Activity Plans; departmental planning is centered on issues in the Guidance Paper; Mission Profiles are drafted and shared with the staff; chairpeople and assistant deans discuss planning priorities; and so forth.

4. The process categories in the Mission Profiles were felt to be restrictive and not reflective of some types of work in departments and divisions. In addition, people are perplexed as to how to deal with those ad hoc projects that invariably appear during that year.

5. Clear and precise communications (for example, regarding equipment requests) throughout the process are critical and if vague can make planning and budgeting especially burdensome to administrators.

Introduction and Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to evaluate on a yearly basis the effectiveness and efficiency of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf/Rochester Institute of Technology, (NTID/RIT) Planning, Budgeting, and Monitoring process for the purpose of improvement and refinement. An evaluation of the planning, budgeting, and monitoring (PBM) process has occurred each year since 1983.

The 1983 evaluation assessed how effectively the recommendations of the 1982 PBM Task Force were addressed. It included a review of the development process and a review of the products themselves. It was an extensive and thorough review of the entire PBM process.

Subsequently, only slight modifications were made to the PBM process. Since the 1984 PBM cycle varied only slightly in response to the results of the 1983 PBM evaluation, the 1984 evaluation was a more focused review of certain salient features, such as the timing of the PBM process, interdivisional planning, and others.

Following that, again only slight modifications were made to the 1985 Planning and Budgeting process. Specifically, based upon the results of the FY84 evaluation, the allotted time for departmental planning was expanded, the kick-off for the planning and budgeting process was delayed to avoid tenure and promotion activities and five activities were eliminated from the process, which were deemed unnecessary and redundant. A major change in the process, unrelated to the evaluation, was the deletion of the activity of developing Mission Profiles and Budgets for FY87 (the "out" year).

Although few changes were made to the PBM system, the 1985 evaluation needed to be more in depth for three reasons: the new academic administration, the revision of the PBM Manual, and the need for a strategic planning process.

The purpose of the 1985 evaluation is threefold:

1. to evaluate the effects of the few changes that were made to the PBM process resulting from the prior year's evaluation.
2. to assess people's overall satisfaction with the system.
3. to evaluate the effectiveness of the planning and budgeting system in meeting its goals:
   a. to develop the strategic plan and budget for submission to the federal government.
   b. to develop the tactical plan and budget for the coming operating year.

Summary of 1985 Planning and Budgeting Administrative Questionnaire

Methodology

As one method of examining the effectiveness of the modifications to the planning and budgeting system, a questionnaire was sent to NTID assistant/associate deans, directors, chairpeople, and managers. The survey instrument was composed of questions related to four major areas of interest: the overall process, the calendar, Mission Profiles, and Interdivisional Planning. Approximately 70 questionnaires were mailed and 42 were returned. Of the 42 returned questionnaires 13 of the respondents worked in Technical Assistance Programs or Public Affairs and 29 worked in Career Development Programs. The average length of time that the respondents had been in their current position was 3.8 years and the average length of time they had been at NTID was 9.0 years. The following section summarizes the responses of the administrators to that questionnaire. Appendix A contains a copy of the questionnaire along with a summary of responses to the objective items. Appendix B contains the verbatim answers of the respondents to the open-ended questionnaire items.

A second method of examining the effectiveness of the planning and budgeting system was an interview/discussion with the executive administrators. The discussion revolved around the key issues raised in the questionnaire.

Items concerning the Planning and Budgeting Calendar

Percentages are based on the number of valid responses for that item. Several items were omitted by one or more respondents. For a complete breakdown of responses, including missing responses, please see Appendix A.

Thirty-three (83%) respondents felt the 1985 planning/budgeting calendar allowed them sufficient time to adequately involve appropriate people in the planning process. Only seven people did not feel they had enough time (two people did not respond to the item). Thirty-three respondents (81%) also indicated they had no difficulty in meeting the various due dates. For those 8 people that did have difficulty with due dates, the most frequently given reason was the timing of the Interdivisional Planning meetings.

Thirty-seven (90%) of the administrators felt the planning calendar was useful in keeping them on schedule and 16 (40%) felt the planning process occurred at the appropriate time during the year. However, fourteen respondents were not sure if planning occurs at the appropriate time and 10 (25%) felt it did not occur at the appropriate time. On the other hand, when asked when they thought planning should occur, the administrators gave a variety of different answers. Six people suggested beginning planning earlier in the academic year and five suggested beginning it later toward the end of the academic year. Please see Appendix B for the complete list of comments. When asked if they feel NTID spends too much time on the planning process only four people said yes, 13 respondents (33%) said yes, but the time must be spent and 23 (58%) said the amount of time was appropriate for the task.

Items concerning the Mission Profiles

Thirty-eight of the respondents thought their department or division (school) Mission Profile followed the prescribed format and 26 respondents (63%) indicated they had no special problems organizing the activities of their department, division or school into the prescribed categories. When asked what difficulties they encountered in using the prescribed categories most of the comments concerned problems with categorizing non-traditional and/or service activities (e.g. research, support department activities).

Thirty-eight of the respondents felt their Mission Profiles were an accurate portrayal of the activities of their department or division. Those activities that were not reflected adequately seemed to be ad hoc projects, programs offered on a request basis, or activities that were unresolved. When asked if they used their department or division Mission Profiles later in the year, 28 people said **yes, when I prepare the Annual Report**, 24 people said **yes, when I write appraisals**, 24 people said **yes, to check our progress periodically** and 2 people said **no, not really**. Four people did not respond to the item (the respondents could check all the options that applied, hence the answers total more than 42). We also asked the administrators for other uses of their profiles. The most frequent response was that they were used when individual plans of work or expectations were written later in the year. Finally, the administrators were asked how similar in content were their Profiles from one year to the next. Three people said they were **almost exactly the same**, 35 people (88%) said they were **very similar with only numbers and titles of some projects changing** and 3 people indicated their Profiles were **not at all similar** from year to year.

Items concerned with Interdivisional Planning

There were fewer responses to questions in this section than in others perhaps because several people were not involved directly in Interdivisional Planning.

The administrators were asked how productive they felt the Interdivisional Planning meetings were. Four people felt they were **very productive**, 16 (52%) felt they were productive, 8 (26%) indicated they thought the meetings were **not very productive** and 2 people thought they were a **waste of time**. When asked if they thought the interdivisional meetings should be replaced with written requests, 11 respondents (33%) indicated **yes, they can and should be replaced**, 19 (61%) said **no, they probably could be replaced but the personal contact is useful** and 4 people indicated they felt the meetings were **useful and necessary**. Administrators were also asked if they thought **the interdivisional planning generated too much paper work.** The respondents were almost evenly divided with 19 people (56%) saying **no there was not too much paper**

work and 15 people (44%) saying yes. However, there were many suggestions for reducing the paper work, most of which centered around simplifying the forms, and keeping the amount of detail requested consistent from form to form. As a final question on Interdivisional Planning, administrators were asked for their suggestions for improving the Interdivisional Planning process. These suggestions varied from beginning it later to beginning it earlier. In general, the comments reflected the difficulty of simultaneous planning. That is: some areas need input from other areas before they can begin their planning and some areas would like feedback on interdivisional committments of support prior to completing their profiles. However, everyone is planning more or less simultaneously and the necessary communication becomes difficult.

Items concerning the <u>Overall Process</u>

For the first time this year, we planned only for the coming year and not for the "out" year (succeeding year). The administrators were asked how this change affected their planning. Twenty-eight people (68%) said the change was positive, it made their work easier; 8 respondents said it made their work easier but they wondered if the "out" year plans were needed to prepare the NTID Federal budget submissions. Six people said their planning was not affected at all and no one felt their planning was negatively affected.

Administrators were asked to briefly describe the internal planning process in their school or division. Thirty-three people responded with full answers. From their responses it appears that there are three equally popular variations to planning within the schools and divisions. One process begins with faculty and staff generating Activity Plans for the coming year. In some departments this revolves around receipt of the "Guidance Paper." After that, the Activity Plans are reviewed and discussed with the chairperson, who then drafts the Mission Profile and shares that with the staff members. A slightly different process begins instead with the department chairperson distributing the current year's Mission Profile to the staff members who then review it, make revisions and updates. Sometime later in the year, individual Activity Plans then are developed. A third variation on the process begins with

department chairpeople and the assistant dean or director discussing planning priorities or direction, often based upon the "Guidance Paper"; these are then shared with staff members prior to drafting Activity Plans and Mission Profiles.

Several consistent conclusions can be drawn from the responses. First, there are a great many cooperative and participative planning discussions taking place within departments and schools. This response was characteristic of most processes: "the process is a give and take, back and forth activity between individual Activity Plans and department activities. The final plan is scrutinized and approved by the department as a whole." Second, it is evident that the service (support) departments rely on the results of Interdivisional Planning for developing their Mission Profiles. Third, the majority of the work of planning and budgeting falls on the department chairpersons and managers.

When asked if, in general, the planning process was easier for them this year when compared to previous years, 23 respondents (66%) said yes, one person said no and 9 people (26%) said it was about the same. As a final question, the administrators were asked for any general comments, suggestions, criticisms or praise concerning the 1985 PBM process. The majority of these overall comments concerning the process were positive. Seventeen people made some sort of general comment, 10 of these were either a positive comment on the process itself or a positive comment concerning the efforts of Dr. Skobjak (e.g. "Every year becomes easier", "Thanks Bernie! Nicely organized (as usual)"). Two suggestions for improving the process related to the equipment requests which they said seemed unrelated to the planning process and two people commented on the need to have the categories in the "Guidance Paper" coincide with those in the Mission Profile.

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW/DISCUSSION

A formal meeting and discussion was held with the executive administrators for the purpose of gathering their perceptions of the 1985 planning and budgeting process.

One major area of discussion was the timing of the planning/budgeting process. It was their belief that the current 2½-3 month planning/budgeting process is more than adequate to allow time to involve appropriate people in the process. However, academic administrators would like the process not to overlap with tenure and promotion timelines. Another problem noted concerned the timing of Interdivisional Planning. Interdivisional Planning should occur at a point during the planning/budgeting process that allows time for consumer departments to develop their preliminary profiles, while also being sensitive to the need of the service departments for timely requests. Another difficulty noted was the conflict with graduation activities and budget hearings. It is recognized that the planning/budgeting process must be completed prior to June 1 on the assumption that there may be an early schedule from the Department of Education. On the other hand, should the budget/plan submission not be due until late June, the hearings may be postponed until after graduation.

Another focus of discussion were the Mission Profiles. The TAP/DPA and CDP profiles, are thought to be an accurate portrayal of planned activities and strategies. However, there is too much detail in some school and division Mission Profiles and not enough in others, which makes analysis of plans and budgets difficult. There was a suggestion that Mission Profiles should be useful as a monitoring tool for programs and divisions.

A third focus of the discussion was this year's change to planning and budgeting for only the coming year and not for the succeeding year (FY87). The executive administrators said that this year's system of one year planning and budgeting seemed to work well. Planning and budgeting for FY86 seemed more real and more serious. The FY87 plan and budget was put together by the Finance Office and Director's office from the FY86 base.

APPENDIX A

TO: ASSISTANT/ASSOCIATE DEANS AND DIRECTORS, CHAIRPEOPLE, MANAGERS

A QUESTIONNAIRE ON:
THE 1985
PLANNING, BUDGETING AND MONITORING SYSTEM

BASED ON A SERIES OF EVALUATIONS CONDUCTED OVER THE PAST THREE YEARS, SEVERAL MODIFICATIONS HAVE BEEN MADE TO THE NTID PLANNING, BUDGETING AND MONITORING SYSTEM. WE WOULD LIKE YOUR PERCEPTIONS OF HOW EFFECTIVE THOSE MODIFICATIONS WERE.

WE HAVE ATTEMPTED TO MAKE THE ATTACHED QUESTIONNAIRE AS BRIEF AS POSSIBLE BUT IT IS IMPORTANT TO RECEIEVE YOUR INPUT IF WE ARE TO CONTINUE TO IMPROVE THE SYSTEM.

SINCERELY,

MICHAEL SERVE MS
BERNADETTE SKOBJAK BLS

NOTE: PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED FORM TO:

BARBARA MCKEE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT
50B-1129 - PETERSON HALL

PRIOR TO:

JUNE 12, 1985

PLEASE TAKE A FEW MINUTES TO ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AND RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

1. YOUR MAJOR ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT: TAP OR DPA 13 CDP 29
2. HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN IN YOUR PRESENT POSITION ? $\bar{X} = 3.79$
3. HOW LONG HAVE YOU WORKED AT NTID? $\bar{X} = 9$ yrs

Complete

CALENDAR

1. Did the 1985 planning/budgeting calendar (time frames) allow you time to adequately involve appropriate people in the planning/budgeting process?

33 Yes 7 No 2 missing

2. Did you have difficulty meeting any of the due dates (e.g. 3/20 for department profiles and budgets, 4/3 for division and school profiles and budgets)?

8 Yes 33 No 1 missing

2A. If yes, could you briefly explain why? _____

_____

3. Did you feel the planning calendar was useful in keeping you on schedule?

37 Yes 4 No 1 missing

4. Do you think the planning process occurs at the appropriate time during the academic year?

16 Yes 14 Not sure 10 No, the process should occur 2 missing

_____

5. Do you feel, NTID as a whole spends too much time on the planning process?

4 Yes, I think I spend an inordinate amount of time on planning

.13 Yes, but the time must be spent

23 No, the amount of time is appropriate for the task

2 missing

PROFILES

6. Do you think your department or division (school) profile followed the prescribed format and categories?

38 Yes 4 No

7. Did you have any special problem organizing the activities of your unit into the prescribed categories?

13 Yes 26 No 1=1.5

1=missing

7A. If yes, could you briefly explain your difficulties?

_____

_____

8. Do you feel your profiles are an accurate portrayal of the activities your department or division will undertake in 1986?

38 Yes 3 No 1 missing

8A. If no could you elaborate? _____

_____

9. Do you use your department or division profiles later in the fiscal year?

4 = blanks
No responses

28 Yes, when I prepare the annual report
24 Yes, when I write appraisals
24 Yes, to check our progress periodically
2 No, not really

Other uses _____

_____

10. How similar in content are your profiles from one year to the next?

3 Almost exactly the same
35 Very similar, only numbers and titles of some projects change
3 Not at all the same

2 missing, 1 double #'s 2 + 3

INTERDIVISIONAL PLANNING

11. How productive were the interdivisional planning meetings in which you participated?

4 Very productive, I received or provided a great deal of information used in planning
16 Productive, I received or provided a limited amount of information used in planning
8 Not very productive, but at least I found out a little about what other areas of the institute are doing
2 A waste of time; they should be eliminated

1 = 1.5
11 = missing

(over please!)

12. Do you think the interdivisional meetings could or should be replaced with written requests?

11 Yes, they can and should be replaced with written requests

19 No, they probably could be, but the personnel contact is useful

4 No, the meetings are useful and necessary

1=2.3 9=missing

13. Do you think the interdivisional planning process generated too much paper work?

15 Yes 19 No 8 = missing

Do you have suggestions for reducing the paper work? _____

_____

_____

14. Do you have any suggestions for improving the interdivisional planning process next year?

_____

_____

_____

_____

OVERALL PROCESS

15. This year for the first time, we planned only for the upcoming year, not the "out" year. How did this change affect your planning?

28 Positively, it made my work a lot easier

8 Positively, my work was easier, but I wonder if the "out year" plans were needed to prepare our Federal submission?

6 Not at all

6 Negatively, I think I and my people need to think at least two years ahead (to get a larger perspective, to accommodate projects that may require several years of work)

1 = missing

1 = 4+3

Other effects _____

_____

16. We're very interested in how the schools and divisions of NTID conduct their internal planning process. Would you briefly describe the process in your school or division? (e.g. faculty and staff develop Activity Plans, Chairperson collates department profiles into division profile.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

17. In general, was the planning process easier for you this year, compared to previous years?

23 Yes 1 No 9 about the same

2 = 1.5 7 = missing

If you have any comments, suggestions, criticisms or praise concerning the 1985 PBM process, please write them in this space.

B.Skobja-198
5/21/85:mni

Thanks for your cooperation.

APPENDIX B

VERBATIM ANSWERS TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

2A. If you have difficulty meeting any of the planning due dates, please explain why:

1) Because it was way ahead of when we actually planned.

2) Interdivisional planning meetings--we barely had time to meet with my folks before those meetings started.

3) Interdivisional planning was weird this year. The budget cuts and restorations were very confusing for my staff. Equipment requests for FY85 and 86 should not have been merged.

4) With only one Chairpersons meeting and one faculty meeting per week, it was difficult to obtain good feedback from faculty and little time for adequate discussion in chairpersons meetings.

5) Need more lead time for Inter-Divisional planning.

6) Due to the process of involving others, much of our programming is across schools/Divisions - we need to establish contact with these groups well ahead of time. It was difficult to arrange before the other areas starting our own planning process.

7) Due dates were met, but not easily. Although sufficient lead time was allowed, Spring Quarter is always the busiest in this department.

8) Conflicts with other major activities such as promotion, salary increments, middle states, etc.

9) Seemed O.K. once process began - but budgets were very dependent upon a lot of unclarified dept. and school issues eg: coordinators interp., counseling, teaching assignments, t/n needs. We still are getting resolution on those issues!!

4C. The planning process should occur:

1) During Spring (ie. March & April) if the calendar could be adjusted.

2) February and March are exceptionally busy times of the year - we seem to rush through planning.

3) When it really occurs - later in the Spring.

4) Is this an appropriate June activity?

5) Related to faculty appraisals/expectations (Sept. start).

6) Earlier

7) It's probably as good a time as any.

8) Frequently seems early, but I don't think we can do much about it.

9) Too early in my tenure to know.

10) At the end of the academic year. In this way a review of the year could be tied into the plans for the upcoming academic year.

11) The problem is -- when else could we do it?

12) Maybe start earlier

13) It would make more sense to have it occur in September or June, when staff members are doing their own POW's - that way the department plans could clearly affect the individuals' plans and vice versa.

14) Earlier in the school year.

15) There is no "good" time!

16) Earlier.

17) Spring, Fall and Winter quarters (in that order) are heavy on academic load.

18) Starting in November, but not increasing or adding tasks to the process. Just give us the calendar earlier!

19) When it needs to - bad no matter when it occurs in terms of workload.

20) Should start a little earlier - with perspectives paper and extend slightly longer.

7A. Did you have any special problem organizing the activities of your unit into the prescribed categories (on the Mission Profile)?

1) As a service unit, we have difficulty fitting into the instruction/curriculum development/teaching load model.

2) Only when we needed to link them to specifics as described in the Guidance Paper. Topics, descriptions didn't parallel language of profile - ie. difficulty to relate specifics -- G.P. & profiles should use same outline/languages.

3) Research projects usually are not neat things - Often continuing and many faceted with lots of subparts.

4) The categorization should be simplified.

5) Hard to know where everything should fit - examples of types of activities for each category would help - beyond the examples we have already.

6) Your titles do not apply. Research is not Faculty or Department - but in - Research Department many items not defined.

7) Projects I am responsible for which fall into the Director's budget - However, the planning re: the above system is not difficult.

8) Some of the categories do not fit our department activities.

9) Forms and categories do not reflect support department activities as well as they could.

10) There are invariably some activities which do not fit a prescribed category. We have dealt with these by simply adding a note of explanation where needed.

11) Informal research activities, information dissemination both occur as such, but seem to be subsumed under career development headings, thus getting lost from view.

12) The outline is OK., #'s are a little confusing in the outline, as 1 dept. doesn't always respond on each topic area. eg: we might do a IIb, but not a IIa.

8A. Do you feel your profiles are on accurate portrayal of the activities that your department or division will undertake in 1986?

1) A great deal of our programs are offered on a request basis or as needed basis. Not possible to identify these activities at time of planning process.

2) But there are always ad hoc projects.

3) It's always hard to plan the numerous "AD HOC" projects.

4) For the most part, I'm sure it will change a little.

5) Doesn't adequately portray consulting activities within the Institute and Committee work.

6) Unless any unexpected crises occur.

7) Some new strategies will be mandated and picked up in individual POW's.

8) However, they are very global, and more is accomplished than is reflected there.

9) Proposal for changes, if approved by Dean's council, may require complete overhaul of profiles.

10) Fairly accurate, but based on what would occur under the best of conditions. Since the best of conditions rarely occurs, lower priority activities are often precluded by emergent needs which cannot be anticipated.

11) Some plans were less specific because the depts. were in flux at the time of planning. Some of those got firmed up in June, but then the Mission Profile no longer reflects the changes.

12) Some unresolved areas, eg. T/N budget/needs, counseling assignments, tutoring coverage.

9A. Do you use your department or division profiles later in the fiscal year?

1) When individual POW's are written in August-September.

2) Being in an "acting" role, I'm not sure how document is used.

3) In order to have a simple, readable reference, I always make a very simple list of projects for the new year - Extracted from POW; simple 1-2 line descriptions with the vital information, everyone in the department has a copy and this is what we refer to throughout the year.

4) When designing individual POW. Forecast future year's profiles.

5) When I/We draft expectations for individual faculty.

6) When preparing individual faculty expectations.

7) Used to write expectations for individuals.

8) I don't use them much now - but if we reduced the mass of information, I would use it more. Pete wanted too much information and now we need to reduce it for the profile to be a valuable tool.

9) To brief new administrators (such as the Dean) on our activities; as a record of the previous years.

13A. Do you have suggestions for reducing the paper work (associated with Interdivisional Planning)?

1) Simplify to one form.

2) It wasn't useful for us to generate, but as the recipient, it was extremely useful, ie. as the user of services. I didn't use the forms, but I did respond to everybody elses and it didn't seem too bad (ie. Media Production, ITV, DPA, Support Services).

3) Some areas request unreasonable documentation. If each area could review the amount of documentation needed it would help.

4) SIMPLIFY! We make things much too complex. A few very simple questions and answers should do it.

5) A good amount, but necessary.

6) We've tried a questionnaire approach, streamlined the questions from year-to-year, and they're 75% blank. Keep questions, but eliminate them filling out questionnaires, yet meet and discuss verbally.

7) Keep the forms, information requested, and amount of detail required consistant throughout. Don't change equipment request forms in midstream.

8) Respond only when requests cannot be filled.

9) If an attempt was made to answer every form, the paperwork would be unweildy. I was selective in answering only those that were relevant, and had several forms with a response of N/A.

10) Make all individual requests fit on a single/one-sided sheet of paper. Follow-up contacts can clarify the specifics.

14. Do you have any suggestions for improving the interdivisional planning process next year?

1) Start it up earlier in the academic year!!

2) There should be some feedback if interdivisional committments of support prior to completion of profiles; maybe this does occur but it does not get back to me in any significant way.

3) Not really - we need the system.

4) I am very pleased with the current process.

5) Yes - it was too early - have it occur when faculty actually have thought about what they'll be doing instead of just guessing way in advance.

6) Just wish people took it more seriously.

7) Give us a little time to complete equipment requests. We had to submit them in February, but they weren't considered for divisional prioritization until May. Let's split one difference and have them due April 10.

8) I'd like to see the TAP/DPA joint meeting scheduled to exchange summary of special/new Institute priorities and projects and noting the inter-linkages of TAP with itself & CDP.

9) Being a new manager, I'm still learning!

10) Not at this time--but if I think something, I will suggest it.

11) Not really - One of the things we need accept is the difficulty of simultaneous planning - i.e. Requests from other areas do not come in until near the end of the planning cycle because those other area's can't.

12) Move it later in the planning cycle - giving depatments enough time to do their planning before the Interdivisional requests are due. The quality and quantity of requests would be enhanced. Half the time I'm guessing at our needs rather than putting in what's actually needed.

13) Let Marcia _____ handle it. She knows what everybody is doing and can field the overlap and communication gaps.

14) Yes - do not invite the Assistant Deans to come at the same time and listen to a TAP and P.A. (PIO) program & ask one person questions for twenty minutes then move to the next person. Talk to us individually and bring us together when there are broad issues.

14. (con't.)

15) I like the follow-up contacts generated from the original planning documents submitted as written requests. I did not need to attend some of the indivisional meetings among administrators above my level, but received follow-up calls for clarification and further planning.

16) If the academic units could plan first, the service units could build their plans based on the needs of the academic areas. Then the service units can add their "other" activities not related to the academic areas.

15. What effects did you see since we planned only for the coming year?

1) In most prior years, our "out year" plans were only rough estimates anyway.

2) This year was easier because last year we wrote 2 plans. My second (year) plan became the next FY plan, with few modifications needed. Next year's cycle may be a little more difficult because of the change this year.

3) I think enrollment trends and projections should be made for the "out" year to be used for estimating overall resource needs - but the project planning always seems like more of the same as for the up oming year.

4) The plans are probably more realistic for the coming year than for two years ahead. However, the longer range thinking is sometimes helpful.

5) We never had clarification that we might not need to do the out year - I felt like that was under the hat - ready to be requested on a fast request anytime now..! It was never clearly stated that the following yr's plan would not be requested - that was unfortunate.

16. Would you briefly describe the internal planning process in your school or division?

1) Department manager takes last year's profile to members and makes revisions in group Department meeting. C"ts were made by Department manager, then conferred with numbers affected first. Then, department meeting to review cuts, and profile changes. In a few months we will do individual POW's based on what is in the profile.

2) 1. Review last years plans to update.
2. Met approximately 10 hours to compose (brainstorm) next year's plans with the faculty - special projects and money needed were submitted by faculty.
3. Wrote up a rough draft of plans (5 hours).
4. Reviewed draft plans.
5. Wrote up final version myself.

My department's process was in the past driven by a School process of defining School and Interdepartmental goals.

3) Chairperson did draft based on last year's draft and was reviewed by supervisors. Second draft went to staff for review. Chairperson wrote final based on all feedback.

4) 1. Requests for services (joint projects, technical assistance, consulting, etc. received from other areas of Institute).
2. Department members sit down and discuss requests.
3. Department members develop individual POW's using requests, continuing projects, own ideas, etc.
4. Chairperson collates individual POW's into Department POW.

5) 1. Staff receives "Guidance Paper" and thinks of things they want to do.
2. Manager receives support requests and lists things we "have to" do.
3. Manager & coordinators meet to determine tentative Mission Profile, Budget needs, Equipment needs.
4. Manager & coordinators contact service requestors to get more details on service needs.
5. Manager puts together BPF's, equipment request, and mission profile, submits to division/TAP director for approval.
6. Budget, Equipment, Mission Profile Approved.
7. Departments requesting service receive "YES" "NO" or "MAYBE" (waiting list, pending additional $, EOC).
8. Staff & coordinators meet to draft expectations for upcoming fiscal year.
9. Fiscal year begins.
10. Annual report information is computed.
11. Previous FY appraisals completed.
12. New FY individual expectations finalized.
13. Prepare to re-cycle to (1) above.

6) Again, this was my first involvement - no real comment.

16. (con't.)

7) Initial Guidance Paper is shared and discussed by all faculty; plans laid out within each department; shared/discussed at school level by all department chairs; back to department faculty for finalization of written plan.

8) 1. Chairs & Assistant Dean provided same priorities for guidelines pertained to Activity Plans.
2. Chairpersons summarized/collated profiles into divisional profile.

9) Shared last years material with faculty for review. Had two meetings with team members to talk about changes and new program plans. Instituted a session to review all forms that needed to be submitted.

10) The chair in this department assumes most of the work, consulting all faculty when needed. This Assistant Dean collates department profiles with divisional profiles.

11) 1. Chairpeople and Ass't. Dean brainstorm to develop major planning foci.
2. Department faculty prioritize the list.
3. Department Chairpeople & Ass't. Dean meet for a School Compilation of priorities. From this list, Management team divides which and how many priorities the school will undertake as a school effort (i.e., cooperation from each.)

12) Faculty generates plan - confers with chair, chair collates and gives to Ass't. Dean.

13) I talk to Joan, Jack talks to me. It's simple, but very complicated.

14) Individuals develop Activity Plans, manager collated department profiles into division, manager collates division profiles into institute, and the Associate Director puts all divisions together as key communication. The director rubber stamps, when he's here.

15) The process is a give and take, back and forth activity between individual activity plans and department activities. The final plan is scrutinized and approved by the department as a whole.

16) Available resources are determined by managers in consultation with their staff. Forms are sent to clients for collecting service requests. Interdivisional meetings are held with clients with managers and division. Director is present to clarify written requests. Managers share requests with their staff and develop department profiles. Division director then takes department input and builds division profile.

16. (con't.)

17) Faculty develop activity plans, but only need inform chairperson if there are significant changes in responsibility. Staff chairpersons prepare profiles for staffs (there are 3 in our department); coordinators do likewise for their areas (there are 2 in our department). Chairperson collates/summarizes/revises individual submissions, and drafts Dept. Mission Profile and Mission Statements.

18) I have two programs that meet separately. I prepared an outline from the Planning paper (Guidance Paper) and faculty created the program objectives for '86. I write the final form, reviewed it with faculty, and faculty volunteered their responsibility for each project.

19) Each faculty member is responsible for other activities in conjunction with the goals and prioritizing the overview. For the first time in many years, our division was realistic in the planning process.

20) Faculty developed plans, Chair collects major department plans, the department plans were discussed with the Division chair's plans, and a division plan is put in place.

21) 1. Faculty reviewed last year's POW.
2. Faculty with Chair prepared next year's POW.
3. All the chairs and division director prepared a school-wide POW/division POW.

22) Faculty and staff develop Activity Plans, Chairperson collates department profiles into division profile.

23) Assistant dean and chairs set direction for the school and identify appropriate projects with faculty interests in mind.

24) 1. a. Faculty & Staff develop activity plans.
b. Chairperson meets with other schools/divisions regarding "cross-utilization" service programs.
c. Where necessary, front line-faculty/staff involved in cross planning of activities.
a. Staff chairperson meets with chairs of own department for cross-team support program efforts.
3. Staff chair collates profiles forwards to Department Chair for collating.

25) Chair determine plans with input and feedback from staff.

26) Faculty and staff develop expectations as a personal POW; Chair collates and writes a department summary, submits to Asst. Dean; AD compiles and writes division profile.

16. (con't.)

27) Department meeting is held to discuss plans/projects for the upcoming year. Requests for services from and for others are generated. Once confirmed as to whether or not services can be provided, profiles are developed.

28) Chair (myself) meet with department faculty in retreat fashion - go over current fiscal year and extend into next fiscal year - thinking through current and future work/plans. Chairs meet with division head to discuss department implications, plans.

29) The Associate Director is responsible for coordinating the Interdivisional Planning in the Division of Public Affairs (DPA).

The entire staff of the Division meets early on in the planning cycle to brainstorm ideas of proactive projects. Most DPA projects are reactive and depend on requests from other Divisons/Departments/ Schools. However, there are a few for which DPA has complete control.

A questionnaire is circulated to all Institute departments asking those responsible to state their requests for support in several areas and to provide time lines and contact persons, if possible. These questionnaires are to be returned before the scheduled meeting of all persons requesting support from DPA.

During the meeting, requests are clarified--often support is requested from DPA that rightfully belongs in another area. This meeting serves two purposes: it allows DPA to gather the necessary information in one sitting and at the same time it provides an education for others as to the several services that DPA can provide.

The Associate Director compiles the requests and provides DPA managers with those for their departments. The managers match requests with staff and budget resources and determine feasability. Occasionally requests must be denied or negotiated. Provision of additional funds is not always the solution for a favorable response.

The managers associate director, and director meet for a final review of requests and budget implications, after which the requestors are informed about the status of their request and the budget amount allocated to it.

The managers then allocate projects to appropriate personnel based on their skill and time. These projects then become a part of each person's plan of work. Theya gree to these and begin work on them October 1. Performance appraisals and goals and objectives are very much interrelated. In the end, ech person can see how his or her work plays an important part and how it fits its into the Divisions goals and objectives.

16. (con't.)

30) The previous years' edition of the upcoming years' statement are circulated to faculty (e.g., last years edition of the "out year" - 'FY86) for updates and revisions, along with any administrative directives or "white papers." After initial feedback is collected, a day of "retreat" is set aside for planning. Statements are generated from the outcomes of the meeting, and about the same as the last year or two, but much easier than previous years.

31) Each department conducts it a little differently: some plan together as a team, others have faculty develop their Activity Plans first, others have the Dept. Chair do the initial bulk of the planning' and (s)he then sit down to discuss this with the dept. Each dept. submits the dept. profile to me as Asst. Dean. I discuss it with each chairperson, we make modifications. I then write a couple of summarizing pages to include as introductory remarks, and the School M.P. is collated, reproduced and distributed.

32) Input from staff - collated/discussed - added to division profile.

33) See _____/_____ for outline.

17. If you have any comments, suggestions, criticisms or praise concerning the 1985 PBM process, please write them.

1) Every year becomes easier.

2) The categories and forms are appropriate for planning (and then monitoring and reporting) our activity.

There is a considerable improvement in this area when what we are now asked to do is contrasted with what we were asked to do in 1982. I have appreciated being consulted as your office has modified and developed the PBM System.

3) The process has seemed stable and rational for the past few years with incremental improvements. That has made it possible to accomplish the planning expeditiously.

4) You are doing a wonderful job in coordinating a very complex planning process. I truly appreciate the work you are doing.

5) Good job - Great improvement over the last four years.

6) Tie "Guidance Paper" more directly into the format of the Mission Profile.

7) We used the same process as last year, and this eased the load, but the process could still be made easier and simpler.

1. We need to eliminate the "Mission Statement" - "Mission Profile" Redundancy - A needless duplication of verbage!
2. Simplify the Categories for planning.
3. Planning is really a very simple process - we should stop overcomplicating it. The planning and guidance paper works fine as a way to set our sights. From there forward, we should just simplify our categorizations, and our processes e.g. various forms.

8) Thanx! Nicely organized (as usual).

9) One area of concern is the equipment schedules, which seems a bit "obscure" from the actual calendar. In my area, equipment planning is critical as technology is constantly changing and to miss out for even one year can put us behind the Institute.

10) In general, it's getting better and better - The forms could be improved of our area, but I admit we are different (research).

11) I appreciated the willingness of Dr. Skobjak to provide guidance through the maze.

12) Thanks for the follow-up.

13) I really like the process and, in the end the faculty do as well. We all know what everyone else is doing, we work as teams and it drives the P.O.W. process.

14) The planning process was not easier for me this year compared to previous years because we had a new division director.

The process is fine when it is applied with sensitivity when there are some needs for flexibility. The division director can absorb a lot of the confusion and sense of urgency that causes panic and anger among the department members. Our division really missed having one person coordinating the whole process. The budget cuts also lowered morale a lot. Equipment requests had to be rewritten twice when forms were changed, because I'd done mine early on the old forms. I was "memo-ed" for being late with my profile revision analysis (Type 1 vs. Type 2 changes) when I'd actually turned it in 2 weeks early because I had to be out of town in April. Ellen D. was wonderful: helpful, organized and pleasant throughout.

15) The categories in the Guidance Paper must coincide with those in the Mission Profile. The fact that they were different caused difficulties this year when the Dean requested 2 page summaries for his briefing the Director. I have alerted the dean to this, too.

16) It is working somewhat better than years past. However, it could be due, in part, to our familiarity with the process. All new managers should go through a "hands-on", practical workshop on fiscal/program planning process at NTID.

17) Our involvement shifts depending on management situations.

18) 1. Continue to update planning notebook - department numbers/budget officers was not distributed this year.
2. Please. Design all the forms to fit a word processor format. Manual typing is a waste of time in this process. For help on this, you may contact me. _____.
3. The equipment planning seems to be a separate process from the "planning process," there should be a way to merge the two, i.e., many POW's are based on getting new equipment which will not be decided until mid-June or later - this is a timing problem.

B.Skobja-199#
11/25/85:sab